

**AGENDA ITEM III A**

**PROPOSED NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAM**

**UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA AT LAFAYETTE AND  
SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY**

**JOINT ED.D. IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

## **AGENDA ITEM III A**

### **PROPOSED NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAM**

#### **UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA AT LAFAYETTE AND SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY**

#### **JOINT ED.D. IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

##### **1. CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS**

<b>August 23, 2002</b>	<b>University of Louisiana (UL) System approves letter of intent.</b>
<b>September 24, 2002</b>	<b>Board of Regents (BOR) approves letter of intent.</b>
<b>March 28, 2003</b>	<b>UL System approves full proposal.</b>
<b>April 2, 2003</b>	<b>BOR staff receives full proposal.</b>
<b>May-August 2003</b>	<b>BOR staff solicits possible External Review Committee (ERC) consultants.</b>
<b>September 4, 2003</b>	<b>List of prospective consultants sent to the University of Louisiana-Lafayette (ULL) and Southeastern Louisiana University (SELU) for responses.</b>
<b>October 2, 2003</b>	<b>BOR staff receives ULL/SELU responses.</b>
<b>October-December, 2003</b>	<b>BOR staff engages services of ERC.</b>
<b>January 5, 2004</b>	<b>BOR staff notifies UL system of ERC visit.</b>
<b>January 29-30, 2004</b>	<b>On-site visits to affected campuses</b>
<b>April 1, 2004</b>	<b>BOR staff receives ERC final report. Report sent to ULL/SELU for responses.</b>

<b>April-June, 2004</b>	<b>Staff conversations with ULL/SELU result in the universities deciding to submit a completely revised proposal which incorporates consultants' recommendations for changes.</b>
<b>June, 2004-April, 2005</b>	<b>ULL/SELU revises proposal.</b>
<b>April 21, 2005</b>	<b>BOR staff receives revised proposal.</b>
<b>August 4, 2005</b>	<b>Revised proposal sent to ERC consultant for assessment.</b>
<b>August 18, 2005</b>	<b>BOR staff receives ERC consultant's assessment of revised proposal.</b>
<b>August 25, 2005</b>	<b>BOR staff sends ERC consultant's assessment of revised proposal to ULL/SELU for responses.</b>
<b>October 27, 2005</b>	<b>BOR staff receives ULL/SELU response to ERC consultant's assessment.</b>
<b>February 22, 2006</b>	<b>BOR staff recommendations relative to ULL/SELU proposal submitted to BOR for action.</b>

## **2. COMPOSITION OF EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE**

The External Review Committee (ERC) was composed of the following: Dr. Irving Hamer (Teacher's College, Columbia University); Dr. William Wraga (Department of Educational Administration and Policy, University of Georgia); and Dr. Carolyn Kelley (Department of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin - Madison). The entire team conducted the on-site visit to both campuses, while only Dr. Wraga considered the revised proposal.

### **3. ASSESSMENT OF INITIAL PROPOSAL BY THE EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE**

#### **SUMMARY COMMENTS OF THE EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE**

##### **Report:**

In general, both the policy and programmatic direction of the State Board of Regents, with regard to establishing a doctoral program in education leadership, are appropriate, timely, and responsive to need... Indeed, recent reforms in teacher certification requirements, regulations for school and district leadership, imperatives for accountability, and the need to support the state's economy with a better educated labor force demands high quality, better prepared, and credentialed education leaders... We think the benefits of establishing a high quality Ed.D. in education leadership will be an enormous boost to the region, schools and school districts, the practitioners charged with leading data-driven, outcomes-based initiatives, and the general economy of the region will benefit immensely from such an initiative.

We think the designers of the proposal have a major challenge. That is, maintaining the basic integrity of the proposal while expanding its scope such that the program might be responsive to future demands and imperatives that are different from those addressed in the current design.

#### **ISSUES AND PROBLEMATIC AREAS IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL PROPOSAL BY THE EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (ERC), WITH RESPONSES FROM AFFECTED INSTITUTIONS**

##### **Staff Comments:**

There were thirty-six specific recommendations in the ERC report. What follows are verbatim excerpts of recommendations and responses.

#### **PROGRAM DESIGN, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES**

##### **Report:**

Goals should be articulated for the core and cognate areas to provide further clarity and coherence, as well as from a consideration of broader program goals. Clarify and expand program goals.

##### **Response:**

The Ed.D. program is designed to prepare individuals to fill future educational leadership positions focusing first on the superintendent and expanding later as the program develops. This degree proposal has been conceived to respond to the immediate need for development of new

and practicing educational administrators. The proposed curriculum is guided by program outcomes that are linked to the National Superintendent standards, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration and Interstate School Leadership Licensure. Although the second two organizations generally address standards for master's programs, the coursework in the Ed.D. will benefit leaders who hope to acquire and maintain the advanced certification requirements for Leader II and Leader III in the state of Louisiana.

**Report:**

Shift the focus from a generic notion of change to a specific notion directed at the purpose of change: for school improvement or enhanced learning.

**Response:**

The Ed.D. will stress inquiry through field-based research targeting the development of effective change leadership strategies to address educational problems and concerns in the state and region. Implicit in this process is the focus on school improvement and enhanced learning. The seminars will focus on the latest research and strategies that address the critical analysis of educational movements and programs to determine if they are in fact improving schools.

**Report:**

Include in the program the development of knowledge and skills that are necessary for policy interpretation and critical analyses characteristic of doctoral education.

**Response:**

The redesigned curriculum contains a seminar with components that will address [this]. Further, the research track will allow candidates to continue to enhance their knowledge of analyzing data, policy statements, and interpretation.

**Report:**

Reconfigure the degree proposal to emphasize knowledge generation, criticism, and problem solving.

**Response:**

The coursework is tied to research strategies. Each course has a research component that will assist candidates in knowledge generation and criticism.

**Report:**

Develop goals and objectives that acknowledge the feasible possibilities and the known limits of integrating technology into the preparation of education leadership.

**Response:**

Graduates from the program will be able to effectively use technology to: (a) communicate vision and purpose through the use of digital video...; (b) effectively use statistical analysis tools...; (c) communicate and collaborate with teachers through email, instant messaging...; (d) utilize electronic systems to improve the overall efficiency of a school; and (e) effectively utilize technology-based assessment and evaluation systems for students and teachers.

## **CURRICULUM**

**Report:**

The proposed curriculum represents a good-faith effort to respond to current initiatives, but it does not project a long-term, systemic view or vision for the preparation of education leadership.

**Staff Note:**

The universities did not provide a direct response to this comment; however, their revision of the entire proposal was meant to represent a collective response to this concern.

**Report:**

Clarify: (a) the distinction and relationship between core and cognate requirements...; (b) the articulation between master's level graduate work, in educational administration and in other disciplines, and the proposed Ed.D...; c) the relationship of coursework and certification requirements...; and (d) the articulation of the research course sequence with the dissertation experience.

**Response:**

(a) The original curriculum proposed a core in leadership with cognates in change and technology. The curriculum was redesigned to provide a core in leadership, change, field-based research and technology. Cognate areas will be developed through Student Choice Seminars and electives approved from departments on campus that offer content in areas that match the candidate's area of specialization. (b) The master's level program focuses on the knowledge and skills necessary to lead a school. The Ed.D. program takes students with the knowledge and skills... and prepares them to critically analyze policies and programs on a district, state, and national level based on a review of data to determine if change is needed, and if so, the appropriate change needed to

enhance student performance. (c) [No change proposed.] (d) The redesigned curriculum has an articulated research course sequence that explores the various types of research methodologies currently in use in the field of education. This research track permeates the entire curriculum and serves as the foundation for all coursework.

**Report:**

Reconfigure the curriculum to include opportunities for both required common and specialized study.

**Response:**

The research and seminar courses are linked together in each trimester. Each candidate will take the same seminar but the project for the seminar will be one in which the student wishes to specialize (e.g. finance, law, technology, leadership, high school, poverty, children, etc.). Additionally there will be Student Choice Seminars that will allow candidates to specialize. Finally, with committee approval, candidates will be allowed to take up to six hours of electives in their area of specialization from departments on campus.

**Report:**

Reconfigure the dissertation experience to provide flexibility in choice of research method, preferably beyond action research.

**Response:**

The candidate, in collaboration with his/her chair and committee, will determine the appropriate methodology for the candidate's dissertation.

**Report:**

Add practical experiences with data-based decision-making to the curriculum,... opportunities for developing understanding of human development, special education, and financial planning and management, and ... opportunities to develop intellectual skills of critical analysis, especially of educational policy.

**Response:**

(a) Both the research component and the course projects will incorporate data-based decision making, ... (b) The curriculum has been redesigned to add opportunities for developing understanding of human development, special education, and financial planning and management with each year having a leadership focus ... ©) The redesigned curriculum is focused on inquiry into ideas, issues, and practices relevant to leadership... Students question, challenge, and test the



work of others, develop their own questions, produce their own original work, critique their work against established theories, and create applied theory or praxis. Students help others relate their own practice to theory. Students, when versed in the theoretical underpinnings of relevant educational theory will then use these underpinnings to create an original idea, concept, or position.

**Report:**

Require a practicum/internship experience as a component of the Ed.D. curriculum.

**Response:**

Practicum experience is included throughout the program in the guise of research projects. The redesigned curriculum requires a research based project as the authentic assessment of each term. The research seminar and leadership seminar students engage in each term of the didactic portion of the curriculum require the student to devise and investigate some aspect of their own educational setting. This investigation requires the students to engage in activities usually considered part of a practicum.

**Report:**

Develop bona fide syllabi for all proposed courses.

**Response:**

The syllabi... will be collaboratively developed by the core faculty.

**PROGRAM NEED**

**Report:**

Conduct a detailed manpower analysis in the target market area.

**Response:**

A survey was conducted and the results indicated not only a need for more qualified educational leaders, but also a desire among present master's students and district educational leaders for the Ed.D. program. An additional effort will be initiated through area school personnel offices to determine how many educational leaders could retire in the next few years as well as how many employees have an Administration & Supervision master's degree and thus are eligible to enter the program. Students in the Ed.D. program will conduct ongoing analyses of these manpower issues as part of their coursework requirements.

## **STUDENTS**

### **Report:**

Devote the initial two to five cohorts to sitting or aspiring superintendents who hold a valid Louisiana Level II Educational Leader certificate... Over time, consider carefully and gradually expanding the target market to a broader array of administrators.

### **Response:**

In the initial pool of qualified applicants, sitting or aspiring superintendents who hold a valid Louisiana Level II Educational Leader certificate... will be given special consideration for admittance to the program.

## **FACULTY**

### **Report:**

Despite the fact that the proposed program is an applied doctorate, we believe that the faculty should hold students to standards of rigor equivalent to a doctorate in philosophy. We are pleased with the successful history of development of doctoral education programs at the ULL... We were concerned that SELU lacks experience in doctoral education, and given its mission in the UL system, is unlikely to further develop a core of doctoral programs that could provide synergy in the development of a culture of doctoral education that supports the kind of rigorous research necessary for quality doctoral education. The development of a culture and policies that can support and sustain high quality doctoral education programs is essential to the success of this joint endeavor.

### **Staff Note:**

The universities did not provide a direct response to this comment; however, their revision of the entire proposal was meant to represent a collective response to this concern.

### **Report:**

(a) The ULL should provide a leadership role in the collaborative... (b) The campuses should use their FTE dedicated to the doctoral program to bring in faculty with experience in doctoral education and doctoral advising... ©) Existing faculty should be carefully selected to include a limited core of faculty engaged in doctoral advising... (d) The maximum course load for doctoral faculty should be no more than six credits per semester... (e) The doctoral faculty from both campuses should meet frequently... (f) The doctoral faculty should be provided resources to participate in national education conferences such as the AERA conference... (g) The faculty search and selection committees should include individuals with significant experience and

understanding of high quality doctoral education programs.

**Response:**

(a) The new Ed.D. will be governed with the full engagement of both universities... with the ULL assuming the initial leadership role based on its past experience with doctoral programs... SELU will take over after a two-year cycle... (b) The campuses will use their FTE as recommended... ©) Each university will identify a core of at least four faculty members for the program... (d) The four core faculty at ULL will be assigned to Track 3 and carry a maximum six hour teaching load each semester... The SELU faculty will be assigned to a similar track... After two years, the workload assignments will be reviewed by the consortium committee and adjusted appropriately... (e) Doctoral faculty from each campus will meet quarterly or as part of an end-of-term seminar... (f) Each institution commits to \$10,000 above and in addition to travel funds of the colleges to provide faculty from both campuses with resources to participate in national conferences and workshops... (g) The UL will utilize the expertise of [appropriately qualified faculty from campus administration] and has also secured the services of [an external consultant]... SELU will [also pull appropriate persons from the wider campus].

**Report:**

An unanswered question is whether SELU in particular can develop the culture, depth, and focus necessary to support a high quality doctoral program... This was a problem at ULL also, but to a lesser extent.

**Staff Note:**

The Universities did not provide a direct response.

**Report:**

In addition to developing professional development and mentoring from other doctoral institutions, the collaborative should develop a formative evaluation plan that will enable them to obtain feedback on the program during its development, rather than waiting for a summative evaluation cycle.

**Response:**

Formative evaluation will be conducted throughout the development of the program. Data collected and evaluated will be presented to the External Advisory Committee and to the Consortium Committee for consideration and recommendation for action. A summative evaluation will be prepared.

**Report:**

A key component of program implementation should be the creation of a seminar for all faculties participating in the Ed.D. program.

**Response:**

ULL and SELU will jointly establish informative seminars to be attended by all faculty members participating in the Ed.D. program. These seminars will be used once each academic term (three per year) during the first three years of the program and on an 'as needed' basis thereafter. The graduate deans will be responsible for establishing and coordinating the agendas for the seminars and will serve as hosts for the event... We realize the wisdom of having information about the 'most common challenges' facing doctoral education today. Our plan at the moment is to draw seminar leaders primarily from the pool of graduate faculty at ULL who are experienced in advising and guiding doctoral students and who have knowledge of doctoral program development and maintenance... External consultants will be asked to conduct seminars.

**Report:**

Great care should be taken when recruiting the initial faculty for the program...

**Response:**

The universities have established a core of initial faculty that will set the tone for the long-term quality of the program.

## **TECHNOLOGY**

**Report:**

Clearly specify technology requirements for incoming students... Provide training and support for candidates as needed.

**Response:**

Each year, specific hardware and software requirements will be defined for individuals starting the program... to support the following: editing and playback of digital video and audio, manipulation/aggregation/desegregation/analysis of data, on-line communication and collaboration, desktop video, a broadband internet connection. The technology experts at the two institutions will determine any additional minimum technological skills, hardware, and software necessary... To assist students, the universities will investigate the possibility of packaging software and hardware necessary for the program.

## ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION

### **Report:**

For the first three years of the program, admit a new cohort of students every other year. Admit two-thirds of the first cohort of admitted students at ULL and work to define and build on the competitive advantages of the two campuses.

### **Response:**

The cohort design has been eliminated, and students will be guided through the program based on the new design that teams research with content in seminar format. Portals with appropriate artifacts will be developed and reviewed by the core faculty to determine if a candidate is ready to progress to the next sequence of courses. The admissions process will involve approximately equal numbers from each campus admitted once a year (probably ten per campus).

### **Report:**

Revise the timeline for completion, such that part-time students will complete 62 credit hours of coursework in three years or less, including summers, with year four devoted to preparation and defense of the dissertation.

### **Response:**

The format has been expanded to provide for completion of all coursework in three years if students are so motivated. Dissertations could be completed within a three-year period or within seven years from the date of initial admission into the program.

### **Report:**

Develop an implementation plan.

### **Response:**

A timeline [for implementation] is included.

### **Report:**

Conduct a mid-point review of student progress.

**Response:**

An assessment cycle is described in the modified proposal. In addition, PASSPORT “portals” [i.e. electronic student portfolios] at the end of each year will monitor and evaluate student progress. The core faculty will review the progress of students based on their portfolio development after each year, prior to their continuing.

**EVALUATION**

**Report:**

Identify a systematic and continuous evaluation process that will assess the impact of the program on students that will lead to program improvements. In particular, we recommend that an external advisory committee be established that includes representation from both professional educators and from educational administration faculty at research institutions.

**Response:**

The program will establish a unit evaluation system that is both formative and summative. An advisory committee will be established during the program implementation phase consisting of all major stakeholders... Summative data will be produced after reflecting the first program completers and program completers each semester thereafter. The unit will evaluate results from an Attainment of Goals survey completed by the candidate during their exiting portal... The advisory committee will review these data and make recommendations.

**RELATED FIELDS**

**Report:**

Examine resources on campus that support offerings for related coursework that could provide a theoretical foundation for research or complementary skills to the educational leadership curriculum.

**Response:**

The Ed.D. faculty at ULL and SELU will continue to survey resources on their respective campuses... [The universities provided lists of specific courses “that can offer breadth and depth to the educational leadership curriculum.”]

#### **4. ERC CONSULTANT ASSESSMENT OF REVISED PROPOSAL**

##### **SUMMARY COMMENTS OF EXTERNAL CONSULTANT**

###### **Report:**

Clearly, faculty members at these institutions have endeavored to respond to the suggestions offered last year by the ERC. As a result of these efforts, the revised proposal reflects significant modifications to the original and thus envisions a stronger and more feasible program.

##### **ISSUES AND PROBLEMATIC AREAS IDENTIFIED BY THE CONSULTANT, WITH RESPONSES FROM THE AFFECTED INSTITUTIONS**

##### **GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

###### **Report:**

The responses and the revisions to the proposal intended to address recommendations 1 and 2 [program goals and focus on enhancing student learning] seem not to represent a significant change from the original proposal... An administrator who possesses the ability to facilitate change can come into an educational situation and change things for the worse and implement changes that impact teaching and learning negatively. It seems prudent that one of the goals of this degree should be to prepare educational leaders with the capacity to identify and solve educational problems in order to promote and to improve teaching and learning... I suggest that the program goals be revised so that 'focus on school improvement and enhanced learning' becomes *explicit* and attention to change strategies becomes implicit.

###### **Response:**

This enhanced revision represents an expansion in the focus of the doctoral program. The emphasis on change has been expanded to an emphasis on creating educational administrators that are excellent executive level leader/managers... The degree program also has an emphasis on school improvement and enhanced learning by the inclusion of the instructional leadership core courses.

##### **CURRICULUM**

###### **Report:**

The proposal was revised so that the three years of coursework comprise only leadership seminars and research seminars that... are sequentially prerequisite to each other... It is typical of doctoral programs in educational leadership to require both electives and cognate courses as part of the formal program requirements. I recommend that faculty reconsider such an arrangement.

**Response:**

The rigidity and inflexibility in this degree program have essentially been eliminated. Only the first course in each of the core course areas will be required as a prerequisite for all other courses in that core. Students will have the opportunity to tailor their doctoral curricula to meet their individual professional needs by selecting courses that would be most beneficial to them. This selection, as well as the selection of transfer courses, will be done in consultation with the academic advisor.

**Report:**

The revised proposal [allows] students to specialize through Student Choice Seminars. Those two seminars, for a total of six credits, are insufficient for developing specialized expertise. There is also the logistical challenge of staffing the [seminars] with faculty who have specialized expertise in all the areas that twenty students would choose. Specialized expertise seems better attained through sequences of related specialized courses.

**Response:**

The degree program has been redesigned so that students may complete all requirements by taking a minimum of 60 credit hours including dissertation. Choice of courses will allow students to develop a specialization (see proposed curriculum map).

**Report:**

In the revised proposal, the research component is reconfigured into the seminar series. One of our concerns was that in the original proposal, action research (an important set of skills for practitioners) was supplanting academic research, which we thought was problematic for a doctoral degree. Year three leadership seminars certainly should provide opportunities for research beyond the building level, but it is not clear that they would. Greater emphasis is warranted on qualitative and quantitative research that transcends action research more than in name. I suggest that the research component of the proposal be strengthened in this regard. A more proportional blend of action research and academic research is warranted.

**Response:**

The emphasis on action research has been modified to include more traditional academic research using quantitative and qualitative research methods. Further, students will have the opportunity to begin their dissertation process early in the program with the addition of 'Writing for Research' courses which will require them to begin the conduct of a comprehensive review of the literature in a topical area that the student may later select as his/her dissertation topic area.



**Report:**

Responses to suggestions... indicate that a 'research-based project' in which students 'investigate some aspect of their own educational setting' (which, again, sounds like action research) required as the 'authentic assessment for each term' will serve as the practicum experience. It is unlikely that NCATE would accept a 'research-based project' as a practicum experience for the Ed.D.

**Response:**

Besides the infusion of field-based inquiry throughout the curriculum, a structured internship will be offered to the students. Care has been taken to ensure that the proposed degree program will meet... state and national standards. In fact, national recognition for the degree program will be sought by undertaking The Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) review process.

**STUDENTS****Report:**

It may be difficult to attract and then retain students in such a lock-step program.

**Response:**

The cohort model has been modified to allow students to take coursework on a more flexible basis. For instance, students who must drop out for a semester will encounter no difficulty in stepping back into the program when they return. The number of students admitted to the program has been increased to allow for sufficient class enrollments in the specialization courses.

## **5. STAFF ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM DESIGN AND RESOURCES AS DESCRIBED IN THE REVISED PROPOSAL**

### **Program Design**

The program comprises 60+ hours of credit beyond the Master's level, divided as follows. Up to six credit hours of appropriate post-Master's level transfer courses may be accepted upon consultation with the student's advisor.

<b>Research Core</b>	9-12 hrs.
- Intro. to Research Design	
- Writing for Research	
- Quantitative Methods	
- Qualitative Methods	
<b>Ed. Leadership &amp; Management Core</b>	27-33 hrs.
e.g.,	
- Leadership Theory	
- Management of Ed. Organizations	
- Ethics and Law	
- Politics & Community Relations	
- Policy Development & Analysis	
- Practicum/Internship (required and spread out across consecutive semesters)	
<b>Instructional Leadership</b>	9 hrs.
- Curriculum Theory and Design	
- Critical Analysis of Current Research	
- Educational Evaluation	
- Integration of Emerging Technologies	
- Special Topics	
<b>Specializations</b>	9 hrs.
- Educational Technology	
- Administration of Exceptionalities	
- (others to be developed)	
Dissertation Research	6+ hrs.
<b>Total</b>	<b>60+ hrs.</b>

### **Admission**

For admission, students must possess a master's degree, certification by the state Department of Education, and appropriate GRE scores.

### **Faculty Resources**

Both universities have requested at least one and preferably two new faculty lines. Desired faculty would possess an earned doctorate in educational administration or a closely related field from an accredited university and have experience serving on and directing doctoral dissertations.

### **Library Resources**

Library holdings will need to be expanded to support the research component and the new course offerings of the program, at a cost of an additional \$1,500 per year for the next five years.

### **Facilities**

No new facilities at either institution are required or requested. SELU opened a new Teacher Education Center in April 2003.

### **Administration**

The program will be governed jointly by a Consortium Board and administered daily by two program coordinators. The administrations of the universities will not otherwise be affected.

### **Accreditation**

Accreditation of the program will be through the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), which accredits Colleges of Education.

### **Cost**

Attached is a copy of the five-year costs analysis. Projections regarding funding sources and amounts was not provided, however, the universities note that "new costs will be provided by reallocation of present institutional resources, obtaining new institutional commitments, and possibly the allocation of new state monies to support the program." **The staff observes that despite program needs the likelihood of new additional state resources to support this venture is slim during this period of financial retrenchment.**

## **6. STAFF ANALYSIS**

The Ed.D. degree is a hybrid: it is designed to produce practitioners and so has an applied emphasis that distinguishes it from an academic Ph.D., yet it nevertheless must embody the rigor, culture, and higher educational standards characteristic of all programs of study at the doctoral level. Striking such a balance for one's students and stakeholders is always a challenge, particularly for an institution new to offering doctoral education in general.

The External Review Committee identified a number of challenges in the initial proposal that the universities addressed in their responses and revised proposal. The overall program goals and objectives were only slightly modified; the curriculum however was enlarged and significantly altered; admission strategies were broadened; commitments to faculty development were established; and numerous other changes to strengthen the administration and organization of the program were made. The consultant who assessed the adequacy of the revisions was favorably impressed.

The objectives and curriculum of the revised proposal remained issues of concern. The program's level of study has been distinguished from the (prerequisite) master's level of study. In their response, however, the universities have not, as the ERC suggested, ensconced 'school improvement and enhanced learning' as the explicit focus of the program. The explicit emphasis of the program on facilitating 'change' remains as before. Yet, the previous inflexibility of the revised curriculum has been radically altered and much improved: students now have access to a flexible program that allows them to specialize and conduct in an established setting and appropriately reflective/critical manner qualitative and quantitative research at the doctoral level that focuses on problems in specific school/district settings. This puts the program on a curricular footing that enables its students to respond more powerfully and precisely to future needs of the profession in specific areas of the state.

## **7. STAFF CONCLUSIONS**

Throughout its changes, this joint program has remained consistent with state and national guidelines for National Superintendent certification standards. The universities have responded in detail to almost all ERC and subsequent consultant recommendations. The staff wishes to commend the universities for the substantive level with which they engaged and addressed the ERC's suggestions and recommendations.

However, because this proposal constitutes a substantive expansion of current doctoral program offerings at the University of Louisiana-Lafayette and the initial effort of Southeastern Louisiana University at doctoral education, the staff strongly believes that implementation and development of this joint program should be carefully monitored.

Further supporting this conclusion is the fact that this new Ed.D. program is specifically designed to correct previous perceived deficiencies in this area and level of study and scholarship. If the State of Louisiana is to extend its teacher education reform efforts fully to encompass related issues in educational leadership, then it is critical that this new program design succeed. Accordingly, it is essential that annual progress reports be required for the next three years at least. Upon receipt of each of these reports, the staff shall conduct a careful analysis and make recommendations for needed changes, if necessary.

## **8. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

*The staff recommends that the Academic and Student Affairs Committee grant conditional approval for the proposed joint Ed.D. in Educational Leadership (CIP 13.0401) at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette and Southeastern Louisiana University, effective Fall, 2006. Beginning July 1, 2007, and on that date for the next two years, the two affected universities shall submit to the Commission of Higher Education a progress report detailing program implementation and development. Depending upon the contents of these reports, additional program requirements may be prescribed.*